

**REMARKS**

The Examiner is thanked for the thorough review and consideration of the present application. The non-final Office Action dated August 5, 2004 has been received and its contents carefully reviewed.

In the Office Action, claims 1-8, 10, 12-14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent 6,275,061 B1 to Tomita in view of U.S. Patent 6,611,241 B1 to Firester et al. Claims 9 and 11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tomita in view of Firester and further in view of U.S. Patent 5,883,609 to Asada et al. Claim 15 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tomita in view of U.S. Patent RE37,847 to Henley et al.

Applicant amends claim 11 to correct a minor typographical error objected to by the Examiner.

The rejection of claims 1-15 is respectfully traversed and reconsideration is requested. Claims 1-15 are allowable over the cited references in that each of these claims recites a combination of elements including, for example, “said control means controls the scanning driver circuit such that the liquid crystal display panel is scanned in a reverse-sequential manner upon testing of the liquid crystal display panel” (independent claim 1); “setting the scanning lines to a reverse scanning mode” (independent claim 8); “sequentially supplying the gate signal to the gate lines in a reverse sequential order upon testing the device” (independent claim 12); and “sequentially scanning the gate lines in a direction identified by the mode setting signal to display a test pattern on the display panel” (independent claim 15). None of the cited references including Tomita, Firester, Asada, and Henley, singly or in combination, teaches or suggests at least this feature of the claimed invention.

The structure of claims 1, 8 and 12 of the present invention are different from the Firester structure in that Firester does not disclose or suggest “the liquid crystal display panel is scanned in a reverse-sequential manner upon testing” as recited in claim 1, “setting the scanning lines to a reverse scanning mode” as recited in claim 8, or “sequentially supplying the gate signal to the gate lines in a reverse sequential order upon testing” as recited in claim 12. The Examiner acknowledges that Tomita does not disclose or suggest this feature of the claims, and does not allege that Asada or Henley do.

Firester discloses “Processor 720 processes in parallel 722a, 722b, . . . 722n to interpret the graphics and sub-image data, processes in parallel 724a, 724b, . . . 724n to apply the appropriate correction functions with the sub-image data to compensate for differing brightness levels, registration and focus between image generators and within each image generator, including the pre-distorting and flipping of the sub-images as described above in relation to FIG. 14” (Firester, column 17, lines 43-51) and “Control set-up 910 enables the generation of a test image 912 which is digital image data representing a test pattern, or a sequence of test patterns, that are to be displayed on screen 920. Generator 912 initiates this by (1) applying the test image data to image processor 914 that generates the aforementioned test image and (2) supplying initial or estimated correction factor values to a parameter adjuster 934. The test image is sensed 930, as by a CCD camera or other sensor, and is analyzed 932 with reference to the generated test image 912 to determine errors therebetween” (Firester, column 19, lines 43-53). Firester does not disclose or suggest “the liquid crystal display panel is scanned in a reverse-sequential manner upon testing” as recited in claim 1, “setting the scanning lines to a reverse scanning mode” as recited in claim 8, or “sequentially supplying the gate signal to the gate lines in a reverse sequential order upon testing” as recited in claim 12.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that claim 1 and claims 2-7, which depend from claim 1; claim 8 and claims 9-11, which depend from claim 8; and claim 12 and claims 13 and 14, which depend from claim 12, are allowable over the cited references.

The structure of claim 15 of the present invention is different from the structure in that Henley does not disclose or suggest “sequentially scanning the gate lines in a direction identified by the mode setting signal to display a test pattern on the display panel” as recited in claim 15. The Examiner acknowledges that Tomita does not disclose or suggest this feature of the claims, and does not allege that Asada or Firester do.

Henley discloses “As there are only a finite number of test patterns which may be applied to the shorting bars, there are only a finite number of expected display patterns. By having the computer control or monitor the test signal selection, the computer is able to select the appropriate expected display pattern, and thus, select the appropriate expected image data to be compared with the sensed image data” (Henley, column 2, lines 34-36). However, Henley does not disclose or suggest “sequentially scanning the gate lines in a direction identified by the mode setting signal” as recited in claim 15. Selecting the appropriate expected image data as described

Application No.: 09/892,647  
Amendment dated November 5, 2004  
Reply to non-final Office Action dated August 5, 2004

Docket No.: 8733.442.00-US

in Henley does not disclose "sequentially scanning the gate lines" in any direction, and certainly not "in a direction identified by the mode setting signal".

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that claim 15 is allowable over the cited references

Applicants believe the foregoing arguments place the application in condition for allowance and early, favorable action is respectfully solicited.

If for any reason the Examiner does not disclose or suggest the application other than in condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to call the undersigned attorney at (202) 496-7500 to discuss the steps necessary for placing the application in condition for allowance. All correspondence should continue to be sent to the below-listed address.

If these papers are not considered timely filed by the Patent and Trademark Office, then a petition is hereby made under 37 C.F.R. §1.136, and any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. §1.136 for any necessary extension of time, or any other fees required to complete the filing of this response, may be charged to Deposit Account No. 50-0911. Please credit any overpayment to deposit Account No. 50-0911. A duplicate copy of this sheet is enclosed..

Dated: November 5, 2004

Respectfully submitted,

By   
George G. Ballas

Registration No.: 52,587  
MCKENNA LONG & ALDRIDGE LLP  
1900 K Street, N.W.  
Washington, DC 20006  
(202) 496-7500  
Attorney for Applicant

Application No.: 09/892,647

Docket No.: 8733.442.00-US

Amendment dated November 5, 2004

Reply to non-final Office Action dated August 5, 2004

in Henley does not disclose "sequentially scanning the gate lines" in any direction, and certainly not "in a direction identified by the mode setting signal".

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that claim 15 is allowable over the cited references

Applicants believe the foregoing arguments place the application in condition for allowance and early, favorable action is respectfully solicited.

If for any reason the Examiner does not disclose or suggest the application other than in condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to call the undersigned attorney at (202) 496-7500 to discuss the steps necessary for placing the application in condition for allowance. All correspondence should continue to be sent to the below-listed address.

If these papers are not considered timely filed by the Patent and Trademark Office, then a petition is hereby made under 37 C.F.R. §1.136, and any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. §1.136 for any necessary extension of time, or any other fees required to complete the filing of this response, may be charged to Deposit Account No. 50-0911. Please credit any overpayment to deposit Account No. 50-0911. A duplicate copy of this sheet is enclosed..

Dated: November 5, 2004

Respectfully submitted,

By   
George E. Ballas

Registration No.: 52,587  
MCKENNA LONG & ALDRIDGE LLP  
1900 K Street, N.W.  
Washington, DC 20006  
(202) 496-7500  
Attorney for Applicant